

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

**P.J. BEARMAN, TH. BIANQUIS, C. E. BOSWORTH,
E. VAN DONZEL AND W. P. HEINRICHS**

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

VOLUME X

T — U



LEIDEN
BRILL

2000

and of adopting a totally secular approach to literature; while their more populist contemporaries accused them of introducing foreign words into Turkish contrary to the prevalent movement of the nativisation of vocabulary, and of not addressing the social problems of the common folk and of snobbery.

The better known authors of the movement are *Khalid Diya* or *Ziya* (Uşaklıgil) (1867-1945), *Tewfik Fikret* (1867-1915), *Ali Ekrem* (Bolayır) (1867-1937), *Hüseyin Su'ad* (Yalçın) (1867-1942), *Ahmed Hikmet* (Müftüoğlu) (1870-1927), *Süleyman Nazif* (1869-1927), *Djenab Shihabeddin* (1870-1934), *Hüseyin Siret* (Özsever) (1872-1959), *Ahmed Reshid* (Rey) (1870-1955), *Mehmed Sami* (1866-1917), *Hüseyin Djahid Yalçın* (1875-1957), *Mehmed Ra'uf* (1875-1931), *Fa'ik 'Ali* (Ozansoy) (1867-1950), *Djelal Sahir* (Erozan) (1883-1935), and *Ismail Safa* (1867-1901).

The movement came into being when the Ottoman empire was in the process of dismantlement, when there was uncertainty about the future of the state and heavy censorship under 'Abdülhamid II, and although the authors were attacked by their contemporaries, the changes which they introduced into late Ottoman literature (both in poetry and prose) were long-lasting. The movement should be seen within the context of the westernisation of Ottoman Turkish literature after 1860.

Bibliography: Kenan Akyüz, in *PTF*, ii, 509-63; S. Kemal Karaalioglu, *Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, ii, Ankara 1982; Bilge Erçilasun, *Servet-i fünun edebiyatı*, in *Büyük Türk klâsikleri*, ix, İstanbul 1989; İsmail Parlatur, *Servet-i fünun edebiyatı*, in *Türk dili ve edebiyatı ansiklopedisi*, vii, İstanbul 1990; Okay Orhon, *Servet-i fünun şiri*, Erzurum 1992; Hüseyin Tuncer, *Servet-i fünun edebiyatı*, İzmir 1995. (ÇİĞDEM BALIM)

THİKA (A.), pl. *thikāt*, qualification used in the science of *ḥadīth* [q.v.] to describe a transmitter as trustworthy, reliable.

Through over-use it gradually lost this positive meaning and, more often than not, it is a virtually meaningless epithet. When not used alone, the term appears often in strings of qualifications which, taken at first sight, seem to be contradictory. The biographical dictionaries of *ḥadīth* transmitters abound in examples of people mentioned as *thika* as well as *da'if* "weak", or *matruk* "to be ignored". More or less the same phenomenon can be observed in the case of another degenerated qualification such as *sālih* [q.v.] "pious", or *ṣaduk* "veracious". The *ridjāl* [q.v.] literature contains multi-volume collections of transmitters depicted in these withered terms, more than anything else reflecting the overall ignorance on the part of the *ridjāl* critics as to the (de-)merits of the transmitter they describe as *thika*. The *K. al-Djarih wa 'l-ta'dil* of Ibn Abi Hätim (d. 327/938) and the *K. al-Thikāt* of Ibn Hibbān al-Bustī (d. 354/965 [q.v.]) are among the best-known of such collections. The latter also wrote a *K. al-Madrūhin*. In this lexicon, the term *thika* is used to indicate transmitters who are definitely not "reliable", e.g. in a special chapter (76-80) he distinguishes several categories of traditions transmitted by *thikāt* which may not be admitted as evidence, such as those by *thikāt* who continuously make simple mistakes, habitually transmit traditions on the authority of weak or mendacious transmitters, and obscure their identities by calling them by their *kunyas* instead of their names and vice-versa, or resort to other forms of the deceit called *ta'dil* [q.v.]. Ibn Hibbān mentions several famous transmitters as exponents of every category. Among these *thikāt* are listed the best-known traditionists of all times such as Sufyān al-Thawrī and al-A'mash [q.v.].

Bibliography: Ibn Hibbān al-Bustī, *K. al-Thikāt*, Haydarābād 1973-83; idem, *K. al-Madrūhin*, ed. 'Aziz Bey, Haydarābād 1970; Ibn Abi Hätim, *K. al-Djarih wa 'l-ta'dil*, Haydarābād 1952-3; for more references, see the *Bibl.* to *ŠALIḤ*.

(G.H.A. JUYNBOLL)

AL-THUGHÜR (A.), pl. of *thaghr*, one of whose basic meanings is "gap, breach, opening", a term used for points of entry between the *Dār al-Islām* and the *Dār al-Harb* [q.v.] beyond it.

It is more specifically used in the plural for the lines of fortifications protecting the gaps along such frontiers as that in south-eastern Anatolia between the Arabs and Byzantines (see 1. below) and for the march lands in al-Andalus between the Arabs and the Christian kingdoms to the north (see 2. below). But it is not infrequently employed by the Islamic geographers and historians in reference to other regions on the peripheries of the Islamic lands, such as those of the Caucasus, Central Asia and eastern Afghānistān facing the various peoples of the Caucasus, the Turks of the steppelands and others. Thus the *Hudūd al-'ālam* styles Dihistān [q.v.], to the south-east of the Caspian Sea, a *thaghr* against the Oghuz; Tiflis one against the infidels (sc. the Georgians, Alans, etc.); and Aswān one against the Christian Nubians (tr. Minorsky, 133, 144, 152). Furthermore, it was used in reference to those coastlands of the *Dār al-Islām* open to maritime attack, e.g. for ports along the North African coast, bordering the Mediterranean or Atlantic, so that Alexandria, vulnerable to Greek naval attacks in the early centuries of Islam and to Frankish ones in the Crusading and Mamlūk periods, is sometimes called the *thaghr al-Iskandariyya*. Aden, facing the Gulf of Aden and the Indian Ocean beyond, and strongly fortified, is similarly described in the title of the work of the 9th/15th century local historian Abū Makhrama, *Tārīkh thaghr 'Adan* (Brockelmann, S II, 239-40); the author lived into the time when the Portuguese were appearing on the coasts of East Africa and were about to enter Arabian coastal waters.

1. In the Arab-Byzantine frontier region.

Here, the *thaghr* were the forward line of fortresses in a region sometimes called the *dawāhī* or *dawāhī 'l-Rūm* "outer lands [of the land of the Greeks]", constituting a kind of no-man's-land; behind the *thaghr* lay the line of fortresses in the rear, the *awāsim* [q.v.] or "protecting [strongholds]". In such a Greek source as Constantine Porphyrogenitus's *De caeremoniis*, the *thaghr* are styled τὰ Στόμα (ed. Bonn, i, 657), and Syriac historians speak of "the land of the Tagrā", as in Michael Syrus (ed. Chabot, iii, 20-1, 467) and in Barhebraeus, *Chronicon* (ed. Abbeloos-Lamy, i, 339-40). The later Arabic historians like al-Balādhuri and the geographers posit a neat two-tier system of the forward *thaghr*, bases for raids and conquest, and the rearward protecting *awāsim*, a zone of settlement, and attribute its formation to Hārūn al-Rashīd, who entrusted these last to members of the caliphal family like 'Abd al-Malik b. Šālih and his own son al-Kāsim, aiming to associate the 'Abbāsīd family personally with the *djihād* against Byzantium; but M. Bonner has recently suggested that the system of Hārūn's time was really the culmination of a long evolutionary process.

The *thaghr* formed an arc running from Tarsus [see TARSŪS] in Cilicia along the line of the Taurus Mountains to Mar'ash [q.v.] (the Syrian *thaghr*) and then on to Malatya [q.v.] (the Djazīran or Mesopotamian *thaghr*). Al-Iṣṭakhri (early 4th/10th century) mentions in this connection the fortresses of Malatya,

al-Hadath, Mar'ash, al-Hārūniyya, al-Kanīsa (al-Sawdā'), 'Ayn Zarba, al-Maṣṣīṣa, Adhana and Ṭarsūs (55-6). Slightly later, Ibn Ḥawkal makes the point that all the *thughūr* are administratively dependent on the province of Syria, and the *Djazīran* ones are only so-called because the *ribāts* there are manned by the men of Mesopotamia (ed. Kramers, 165, 168, tr. Kramers and Wiet, 163, 164-5). The *Hudūd al-'ālam* (372/982) borrows largely from al-Isṭakhṛī, but rearranges the fortresses of the *thughūr-hā*, and ends them in the south-west with Awlās (Eleusa), as being the last town of Islam on the coast of the Sea of Rūm (tr. 148-9). Al-Dīmashqī (8th/14th century) lists the Mesopotamian *thughūr* as Malatya, Kamakh, Shimshāt, al-Bīra, Ḥiṣn Maṣūr, Kal'at al-Rūm, al-Hadath al-Ḥamrā' and Mar'ash, and those of Syria as Ṭarsūs, Adhana, al-Maṣṣīṣa, al-Hārūniyya, Sīs and Ayās (ed. Mehren, 214). But by the time this latter author was writing, the *thughūr* had ceased to have any significance as outposts against the infidels, for the embattled Rupenid kingdom of Little Armenia, which alone of the former Christian powers of the region survived Mamlūk pressures until 776/1375 [see sīs], was no serious military threat to the Muslims. The terms *'awāṣim* and *thughūr* lingered on in Mamlūk administrative geography, but anachronistically, as when al-Kalkashandī, *Shubh al-a'shā*, iv, 228-9, lists the *niyābas* of the *thughūr* and *'awāṣim* and adjoining lands: eight along the Syrian march (Malatya, Dabragī (Diwrigī), Daranda, Abulustayn (Elbistan), Ayyās, Ṭarsūs and Adhana, Sirfandakār and Sīs) and three in the Mesopotamian lands to the east of the upper Euphrates (al-Bīra, Kal'at al-Dja'bar and al-Ruhā or Edessa).

During the five centuries or so of confrontation and warfare between the Arabs and Byzantines, and then with the Franks and Armenians also, the fortunes of war swung backwards and forwards, so that fortresses of the zone of the *thughūr* might be abandoned by one side, left desolate and then rebuilt and repeopled by the other side; this process can clearly be seen in the history of such points as Malatya and Tarsus [q.v.]. Life in these march regions bred a tough and self-reliant people, and on the Muslim side, volunteers (*muta'awwifā* [q.v.]) were attracted as *ghāzīs* or fighters for the faith from as far away as Khurāsān and Transoxania, settling in their own *ribāts* [q.v.]. We possess a specially valuable documentation for this way of life and its exponents in such geographers as Ibn Ḥawkal and from the surviving extracts from the later 4th/10th century work of a local writer of Tarsus (see C.E. Bosworth, *The city of Tarsus and the Arab-Byzantine frontiers in early and middle 'Abbāsīd times*, in *Oriens*, xxxiii [1992], 268-86; idem, *Abū 'Amr 'Uthmān al-Ṭarsūsī's Siyar al-thughūr and the last years of Arab rule in Tarsus (fourth/tenth century)*, in *Graeco-Arabica*, v [Athens 1993], 183-95).

Bibliography (in addition to references in the article): Yāqūt, *Buldān*, ed. Beirut, ii, 79-81, s.v. *Thaghūr*, and above all, the *Bibl.* to *'awāṣim*, which notes such especially important references as Le Strange, *Eastern lands of the Caliphate*, 128 ff., Honigsmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071*, and Canard, *H'amanides*, i, 241-86, with maps I and IX facing pp. 240, 248. See also now M. Bonner, *The naming of the frontier: 'Awāṣim, Thughūr, and the Arab geographers*, in *BSOAS*, lvii (1994), 17-24. (C.E. BOSWORTH)

2. In al-Andalus.

In the context of the mediaeval history of the Iberian Peninsula, the term *al-thughūr* has, in addition to its general sense, a specific meaning applicable to

what English-speaking historians of Muslim Spain normally render as "the Marches". In the absence of any direct or indirect indication to the contrary, this expression is to be taken as the designation of three major frontier zones brought into existence by the Hispano-Umayyads, viz. the Upper, the Middle and the Lower. In the earliest days of Umayyad rule these *thughūr* seem to have amounted to little more than outlying bands of sparsely populated, or even uninhabited, territory dividing Muslim forces from entrenched indigenous Christians determined to resist subjection. Garrisoned in a line of strategically placed castles and fortresses, the Muslim troops were detailed to consolidate Islam's position in the territory it had gained and to form an effective barrier against possible enemy incursions. Just as their mission was military, so was the command under which they operated. As time passed, these early fortified lines assumed increasingly greater proportions and developed into sizeable regional entities, governed from what were, in effect, regional capitals dominating not only a well-organised system of fortifications, but also a greater or lesser spread of towns, villages and hamlets. The inhabitants of the latter were sustained by the produce of surrounding cultivable land—from which, however, one should not infer a density of population, with all that that implies, comparable to that characterising the southern heartlands of al-Andalus. Whatever geographical, political and administrative variables there may have been in the history of the *thughūr*, their essentially military character remained a constant.

Of the original three marches, the most northerly and accordingly the most remote from Umayyad Cordova was the Upper March (*al-thaghūr al-a'lā*), which, probably because of its remoteness from the capital, was also designated the Farther March (*al-thaghūr al-aḳṣā*), an expression which, in an appropriate context, has a narrower sense applicable only to the very northern reaches of the March, centred on Huesca and Barbiṭāniya (see below). Two other names known to have been given to the Upper March are the Great March (*al-thaghūr al-aḳbar*) and the Supreme March (*al-thaghūr al-a'zam*).

Like all other *thughūr* in al-Andalus of whatever kind of whatever period, the Upper March was never a region bounded by immutable, neatly drawn frontiers, but, rather, a variable entity expanding and contracting with the vicissitudes of war waged by Muslims and Christians in their efforts to gain or maintain the upper hand. Thus, in the earliest days of its existence, the Upper March covered, in theory, an area comprising territory north of the Pyrenees. However, the Christian conquest of Pamplona (Banbalūna [q.v.]) in 183/799 and Barcelona (Barshalūna [q.v.]) in 185/801 marked the start of a new era during which the Upper March was to emerge as a much more durable and, at the peak of its development, a somewhat more clearly identifiable entity. As such, it is said to have comprised, in broadly descending order from the north-east to the south-west, the areas, or zones (*aḳālīm*), centred on Barbiṭāniya (an area between present-day Boltaña in the north and Barbastro (Barbāshṭuru [q.v.]) in the south), Huesca (Washka [q.v.]), Tudela (Tuṭīla), Saragossa (Sarakuṣṭa [q.v.]), Lérida (Lārida [q.v.]), Calatayud (Kal'at Ayyūb [q.v.]) and Bārūsha (precise location uncertain, but situated south of Daroca (Darūka) and including today's Molina de Aragón (Mulīna). Add to which the region of Tortosa (Turtūsha)—omitted from the foregoing list only because of its limited scope precluding inclusion of a centre well to the south-east of Saragossa on the

lower reaches of the Ebro. Viewed at a later period on a lesser scale and from a different perspective, the Upper March is seen as comprising only its lands to the west of Lérida, its eastern parts constituting a separate regional grouping designated the Eastern March (*al-thaḡhr al-sharkī*). In the 4th/10th century, this *thaḡhr* took a southward course from Lérida through Fraga (Ifrāgha [q.v.]), eventually reaching Tortosa and continuing thence to the Mediterranean coast. Whatever changes, administrative or otherwise, may have accompanied the emergence of this Eastern March, one change that did not take place was the removal of supreme command from Saragossa, which from the outset had been the capital, or mother city (*umm*), of all territories constituting the Upper March.

For the Umayyads, the Upper March was to prove both a source of strength and a source of weakness. It was a source of strength in that its strong defences enabled the central government to maintain as secure a hold as possible on its southern heartlands, but a source of weakness in that Cordova's rulers had only too often to devote much time and energy to devising means of coping with the ambitions of those of their commanders for whom, as for certain local overlords also, subordination to Cordova stood in the way of their realising their aspirations to autonomy.

Since much of the history of the Upper March is inseparable from that of Saragossa, which is well adumbrated in M.J. Viguera's article [see SARAḠUSṬA], and is also intertwined with the geographical and political history of the Spanish Aragon so capably unravelled in P. Chalmeta's article on this province [see ARAGUṢUN in Suppl.], only one or two points remain to be noticed here. First, immediately following the demise of the Umayyads, the northern reaches of the old realm enjoyed a greater degree of stability than most parts of al-Andalus, thanks to power already acquired in Saragossa by those who had long sought absolute independence. These were, first, the Tudjibids and, secondly, the Hūdids, their successors, who held on to their *īā'ifa* kingdom [see MULUK AL-TAWA'IF] until the occupation of Saragossa by the Almoravids (*al-Murābiṭūn* [q.v.]) in 503/1110. Despite Almoravid intervention, the city was to fall to Alfonso I of Aragon in 512/1118, and by mid-century Christian control of all the territories of the old Upper March was virtually complete. Though now subject to Christian rule, the vast majority of the Muslim population of those territories chose not to emigrate but accept Mudéjar [q.v.] status and to stay put. The origins of this stratum of society were not to be forgotten, for in the Spanish *tagarinos*—a term used particularly in 17th-century European sources (Fr. "Tagarins") to denote primarily the Moriscos of Aragon, but also those of Valencia and Catalonia—we find a clear echo of *thaḡhr*/*thaḡhri* (adj.).

That in early Umayyad times there were three major *thaḡhūr*, viz. the Upper, the Middle (*al-awsaṭ*) and the Lower (*al-adnā*), is an undisputed fact. Precisely when this tripartite division came into being is unclear, but there is no doubt that it existed in the 3rd/9th century. Originally, the Muslim line of defence for the Lower March was based on Mérida (Mārida [q.v.]) and ran westward through Badajoz (Baṭalyaws [q.v.]) over part of the Estremadura and part of central Portugal down to the Atlantic coast. The Middle March, which began more or less where the old Upper March ended in the region of Bārūsha (see above), descended in a south-westerly direction, passing, by the end of the reign of Muhammad I (238-73/852-86), through a chain of fortified towns and cities, including Madrid (Madjrit [q.v.]), Talamanca (Tala-

manka), Canales (Kānālīsh), Olmos (Wulmush) and Calataifa (Kāl'at al-Khalifa), towards its seat of government, Toledo (Ṭulayṭala [q.v.]) and thence to territories bordering on the Lower March.

As times and situations changed, so did the *thaḡhūr*. In the reign of the great 'Abd al-Rahmān III (al-Nāṣir) (300-50/912-61 [q.v.]), whose tireless and conspicuously successful military activities firmly secured his realm against Christian encroachment, we find mention of just two major *thaḡhūr*, of which one is designated *al-aḡṣā* and the other *al-adnā*. Of the former nothing need be added here to what has already been said. The latter, however, calls for comment, for the Lower (or Near/Hither) March had come to denote a modified Middle March. Control of this *thaḡhr*, a bulwark against Castile and the Kingdom of Leon, was removed from Toledo to Medinaceli (Madīnat Sālim [q.v.]), a town situated well to the north on the verge of the Upper March and transformed on the orders of 'Abd al-Rahmān III into a heavily fortified base for *ṣawā'if* (sing. *ṣā'ifa* [q.v.]). And so, before or around the middle of the 4th/10th century, *al-thaḡhr al-adnā/awsaṭ* denoted a vast area which it is best to describe here only in the loosest and most general terms with reference to places that can be easily located on modern maps of Iberian Peninsula. So, if we take Toledo on the Río Tajo as our starting-point, the *thaḡhr* ascended northward through Madrid in the direction of the Sierra de Guadarrama and the Río Duero (Portug. Douro). In the north-east it took in, among other places, Uclés, Cuenca, Huete, Santaver, Guadalajara and Medinaceli, while in the north-west it ran through Talavera, Coria and Coimbra.

Until the end of the 4th/10th century no major changes took place in the general pattern of these frontier zones as it stood at the time of al-Nāṣir's death in 350/961, but not long before 400/1009 the caliphate that he had instituted began to lose control of al-Andalus, and, as disintegration set in, the Christians turned Muslim disunity to whatever advantage they could whenever they could. Not surprisingly, then, major changes in the configuration of the border territories took place in the period running from the definitive conquest of Toledo by Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile in 478/1085 to shortly after the mid-6th/12th century, by which time the long Christian follow-up to the taking of Saragossa was very near its end. Following the disappearance of the territories once controlled from Toledo and Saragossa, no defensive system comparable to that represented by the *thaḡhūr* as devised and developed by the Umayyads emerged to replace it. Accordingly, it was only a matter of time, once Ferdinand III of Castile and Leon had taken Cordova (633/1236) and Seville (646/1248), before Muslim rule in the Iberian Peninsula was eliminated from all but the small kingdom of the Naṣrids [q.v.] of Granada.

Relevant to the subject of *thaḡhūr* in al-Andalus are one or two terms on which comment may be helpful. First, there is reason to believe that *al-thaḡhr al-sharkī* and *al-thaḡhr al-dhāwī* (adj. "northern", but to be taken as applying in particular to the north-west), which occur in a 7th/13th-century text, are terms which had, as Muslim frontiers receded, come to replace *al-thaḡhr al-aḡṣā* and *al-thaḡhr al-adnā*, respectively. Secondly, *al-thaḡhr* and *bilād al-thaḡhr*, when unqualified, almost always denote the old Upper March. For further and better particulars Bosch Vilá's *Algunas consideraciones* (see *Bibl.*), though in need of updating, is useful.

One final point: the complex subject of the place of the *thughūr* in the administrative system of al-Andalus has been felt to be beyond the scope of this article.

Bibliography: 1. On the question of primary sources, see the *Bibl.* to ṢĀʿĪFA. 2, from which, through an oversight, was omitted F. de la Granja (tr.), *La Marca Superior en la obra de al-ʿUdri*, Saragossa 1966; on uses of *thughūr* in *al-Muktabis*, v, see under “Marca” (16 separate entries) in index to M^a J. Viguera and F. Corriente (tr.), *Cronica de ʿAbdarrahmān III*, Saragossa 1981.

2. Secondary sources: E. Lévi-Provençal, *Hist. Esp. mus.*, iii, index *svv.* “Marche(s)” (5 separate entries) see also map, i, 192; J. Bosch Vilá, *Algunas consideraciones sobre “al-tagr” en al-Andalus*, etc., in *Études d’orientalisme dédiées à la mémoire de Lévi-Provençal*, Paris 1962, 23-33, esp. 24-40; idem, *Historia de Albarracín musulman*, Teruel 1955; E. Manzano, *La frontera de al-Andalus en época de los Omeyas*, Madrid 1991; idem, *La Marche Supérieure d’al-Andalus et l’Occident chrétien*, Madrid 1991; M^a J. Viguera, *Aragón musulmán*, ²Saragossa 1988 (containing maps and excellent bibl.); L. Molina and M^a L. Avila, *Sociedad y cultura en la Marca Superior*, in *Historia de Aragón*, iii, Saragossa 1985; A. Huici Miranda, *Historia musulmana de Valencia*, 3 vols., Valencia 1970; *Colloque la Marche supérieure d’al-Andalus et l’Occident chrétien*, Casa de Velasquez and the University of Saragossa, Madrid 1991; C. Laliena and Ph. Sénac, *Musulmans et chrétiens dans le Haut Moyen Âge. Aux origines de la reconquête aragonaise*, n.p. [Paris] 1991; *Colloque de Toledo a Huesca. Sociétés médiévales en transition, a finales del siglo XI, 1080-1100*, University of Saragossa 1998.

(J.D. LATHAM)

THULĀ, an historic, walled town of about 4,000 people (al-Waysī, 65, published in 1962) situated at about 45 km/28 miles from the main town of the Yemen, Ṣanʿāʾ [q.v.], and placed by Werdecker (139), after Glaser, in 15° 36' latitude and 43° 53'. The town is overlooked by an impregnable fortress perched on the mountain above which can be seen from very great distances all around. Tradition tells us that the town takes its name from a certain Thulā b. Lubākha b. Akyān b. Ḥimyar al-Aṣghar. It is also the centre of a district (*kaḍāʾ*) of the same name.

The town is undoubtedly of ancient origin. Al-Hamdānī (107), writing in the 4th/10th century, simply states that it is a stronghold (*ḥiṣn*) and a village belonging to the Marrāniyyūn of Hamdān, and it is clear that the town took on more political and military importance during the Ayyūbid (569-626/1173-1228) and Rasūlid (628-845/1230-1441) periods and particularly under the later Zaydī Imāms. The town is associated in particular with the Zaydī Imām al-Muḥabhar b. Ṣharaf al-Dīn who died in 980/1572. His tomb lies inside the *madrasa* of his son, Ṣharaf al-Dīn, within the walls of Thulā (see Golvin and Fromont, *Thula*, 42-6, and photographs 30-5, pp. 196-8). The major architectural features of the town, mosques, *madrasas*, tombs and gates, of the latter, nine in all, can all be seen in Golvin and Fromont, 17, fig. 2, which is a general plan, and the work as a whole is an excellent study of the architecture of Thulā.

Thulā was visited by both Niebuhr in the 18th century and Glaser in December 1883. The latter wrote a particularly detailed account of the town (see both Grohmann's art. *Thulā*, in *EI*¹, and Werdecker, 38-9, both written from Glaser's manuscript account). Glaser reckoned Thulā to be the second largest town in the Yemen after Ṣanʿāʾ, and its narrow streets were

flanked with regularly-built houses in yellowish-red stone. Glaser first thought the ascent to the citadel to be impossible, but he was assisted by local climbers and a strong rope. He calculated the *ḥiṣn* to be of some antiquity. He mentions cisterns and about twenty granaries called *madāfin*, cone-shaped structures made out of sandstone and about six or seven metres deep. He also mentions caves hewn out of the rock called *ḡuruf*.

Bibliography: J. Werdecker, *A contribution to the geography and cartography of North-West Yemen*, in *Bull. de la Société Royale de Géographie d’Égypte* (1939), 38-9; Husayn b. ʿAlī al-Waysī, *al-Yaman al-kubrā*, Cairo 1962, 65; L. Golvin and Marie-Christine Fromont, *Thula, architecture et urbanisme d’une cité de haute montagne en République Arabe du Yémen*, Paris 1984, *passim*; Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Ḥaḍjārī, *Maḍmūʿ buldan al-Yaman wa-kabāʾilī-hā*, ed. Ismāʿīl b. ʿAlī al-Akwaʿ, Ṣanʿāʾ 1984, i, 166-7.

(G.R. SMITH)

THULUTH [see *KHATT*].

THUMĀMA B. ASHRAS, ABŪ MAʾN AL-NUMAYRĪ, Muʿtazilī theologian, d. 213/828.

Of Arab descent (and proud of it), he entered upon a secretary's career. He served under the Barmakids and was put under arrest after their downfall in 186/802. However, in 192/807 his reputation had so far been restored that Hārūn al-Rashīd had him join his expedition to Khurāsān. When, one year later, the caliph died at Tūs, Thumāma stayed in the East with al-Maʾmūn, obviously as one of his administrative advisers. In 201/817 we find him among those who, by their signature, bore witness to the document where al-Maʾmūn proclaimed ʿAlī al-Ridā as his successor. Yet he never held a high official post, neither at Marw where al-Maʾmūn resided until 202/818 nor later at the court of Baghdad when the caliph had returned to Irāk in 204/819. Publicity was much greater, though, in the old capital than it had been in Khurāsān; he therefore became the hero of numerous anecdotes in *adab* literature. People saw in him a kind of *éminence grise*, influential in a way but mainly famous for his wit and his detached and liberal irony. His feeling for Arabic style and his interest in eloquent speech made him a typical representative of the state bureaucracy.

As a theologian he did not write as much as did most of his Muʿtazilī colleagues, nor does he seem to have had the ambition of developing an overall “system”. He agreed with Muʿammar [q.v.] in assuming that all beings have a “nature” (*tabīʿa*), but at the same time he was convinced that those who really act are only God and man. Man is distinguished among all creatures by his will; this is what he has in common with God. By his will he may direct nature, or rather, the natures, i.e. his own one as well as that of other beings. This does not, however, exclude the fact that beings, whether living or inanimate, also function by themselves. Effects are not caused by a personal originator (*muhdith*) as he said, rejecting by that the concept of *tawallud* developed by his contemporary Bishr b. al-Muʿtamir [q.v.]. The consequences of his theory come out most clearly in his epistemology. Knowledge is not acquired but spontaneous, and man becomes responsible for it only when he wills it. An unbeliever therefore deserves punishment only when he consciously rejects the truth; pagans who have never heard about Islam are not subject to any retribution, positive or negative, but simply become dust when they die (a fate which, according to sūra LXXXVIII, 40, the real unbelievers would be happy